DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 157 EA 016 254

TITLE	School Day/School Year Mandates. A Report and Preliminary Recommendations.
INSTITUTION	Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE	Oct 83
NOTE	49p.; Portions of appendixes may reproduce poorly due to small print.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Core Curriculum; Educational Improvement; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Extended School Day; *Extended School Year; Required Courses; *Scheduling; School Effectiveness; School Responsibility; School Statistics; Secondary School Curriculum; State Boards of Education; *State Legislation; *State School District Relationship; State Surveys; Statistical Surveys; *Time Factors (Learning)
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

As part of a comprehensive study of all mandates placed by the state of Illinois on elementary and secondary education, an analysis was undertaken of the school day/school year mandate in its historical perspective, inquiring into its original purpose, how well that purpose has been served, whether the mandate is still needed, and whether a differently defined or implemented mandate would yield the desired result. The study revealed that since 1959 (when the minimum required daily instructional time was extended to 5 hours), the substantial increase in new instructional mandates and ancillary educational services, reflecting a common belief in education as a vehicle for social change, has imposed a burden on school time allotments, as new programs necessarily displace time previously devoted to the basic purposes of schooling. Accordingly, an increase in the school day or school year in itself will not guarantee improved student achievement. Rather, the state should define the academic core of instruction, mandating five hours each day for language arts, foreign languages, mathematics, science, and social studies (including history), while adding two hours to accommodate other instructional services. Appendixes are provided, including statutes, regulatory references, and selected statistical data. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D.G. Gill

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA

ED238157

SCHOOL DAY/SCHOOL YEAR MANDATES

A REPORT
and
PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

EA 016 254

SCHOOL DAY/SCHOOL YEAR REPORT

AND

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Walter W. Naumer, Jr., Chairman
State Board of Education

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

Springfield, Illinois

October 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Historical Review and Analysis	5
III.	Summary and Conclusions	15
IV.	Preliminary Recommendations	20
	Selected References	22
	Appendices	24

SCHOOL DAY/SCHOOL YEAR MANDATE REPORT

AND

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

In September 1981, the Illinois State Board of Education adopted, and directed State Superintendent Donald G. Gill to implement, a three phase plan for the careful and deliberative study of the mandates placed on elementary and secondary education in the state. This plan grew out of increased concern at all levels of government for eliminating unnecessary or modifying unproductive mandates and for increasing decision-making at the level nearest the delivery of educational service. However, its emphasis on a deliberative analysis of mandates reflected the Board's commitment to guarding against indiscriminate and precipitous removal of laws and regulations which serve an important purpose.

This report of the school day/school year mandate is one of five reports to be presented during Phase II of the Board's plan. The other reports address transportation, compulsory attendance, student records, and the student health mandate.

The report which follows provides analysis and preliminary recommendations regarding the mandated school day/school year. Following a period of public comment and Board discussion, final recommendations for action will be presented to the State Board of Education.

Assumptions

Establishing priorities, setting acceptable conditions and allocating resources for public education are among the most fundamental decisions of the state. These decisions are crucial because they determine in large measure the range of educational opportunities in Illinois. In mandating the school day/school year, the state has established minimum acceptable conditions and much more importantly it has fixed the required level of a vital resource: time for education.

The state's school day/school year mandates set fundamental parameters for public education. They establish a critical aspect of the environment affecting student achievement in Illinois schools and they define important boundaries for instructional opportunity . For these reasons analysis and decisions concerning the school day/school year have to be based on a review of the tasks demanded of the public schools in light of the time required to be made available for accomplishing them.

As a consequence, this study proceeds from these additional assumptions:

1. Controlling the time and tasks of schooling are among the most powerful tools the state has for affecting student achievement and the quality of schooling.

2. A given amount of time does not ensure achievement, but it does create an opportunity for achievement that may not be possible without it.

3. Allocation of time for education is an important indication of the state's priority for education.

Methodology

Sources of information used for this report include The School Code, historical documents (published and unpublished), research studies as well as documents reviewing research studies, statistics collected by the State Board of Education - including data from previously issued mandate studies and correspondence and other forms of communication with a wide variety of individuals.*

Historical and other types of information concerning the school day/school year covering periods since the late 19th century in Illinois and other states were reviewed by staff, but this report focuses on the period from 1959 to the present. The reasons for this are twofold. First, 1959 marks the most recent year in which the school day/school year was significantly altered; and second, the years since 1959 have encompassed numerous and substantive changes in the tasks schools in Illinois have been either mandated or otherwise expected to perform.

The information has been organized to provide an historical perspective on the development of the school day/school year in relation to the changing tasks and conditions affecting schooling; and an analysis of the interactions between time for schooling and tasks for schooling. A consideration of the school day/school year mandates in terms of the five analytical questions which have been applied to each of the mandates studied is also provided. The five questions and their explanatory comments are presented below.

1. What desirable condition or outcome is called for by the mandate?

   An essential step in determining the necessity of a requirement is being able to determine that it is purposeful, seeks to improve an existing condition, or creates a new and desirable condition. A mandate should be clearly directed towards an end which is stated in such a manner that its achievement can be reasonably assessed.

---

*While accepting full responsibility for the contents of this report, we acknowledge and have benefited from the work of an interdisciplinary team of scholars from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign who were asked to assist us. The team was led by Professor Fred S. Coombs and its papers are cited in the Appendices.

2. Is there evidence that in the absence of the mandate the condition or outcome will not be achieved?

   In this context evidence may consist primarily of historical or trend data or comparisons with other states in order to determine the likelihood of success in the absence of a requirement. One major factor for consideration could be the amount of time available for implementation; that is, whether the condition needs to be met by a date certain or whether it is of such a nature that time is not a driving factor.

3. As presently defined does (can) the mandate yield the desired results?

   While measuring results may be a relatively straightforward proposition, the more complex but necessary task of determining - or attributing - cause/effect must also be undertaken. The need exists to be reasonably assured that it is the mandate which yields the desired result and not other uncontrolled factors.

4. Could the mandate be defined and/or implemented differently and yield the desired results?

   The nature of the mandate and any required administrative mechanisms should be consistent with the most current and accepted research and professional experience. Regulations should be as simple and direct as possible and allow for efficient and effective use of resources.

5. Does the mandate reflect a compelling state interest?

   The state's interest in mandates can be based on such principles as equality, equity, efficiency, compliance with higher authority or health and safety. There can also be compelling interests that reflect the state's values in terms of required activities, experiences or settings. The maintaining or establishing of mandates should be tied directly to an identifiable need of the state to cause the required activity.

The study ends with a set of conclusions and preliminary recommendations for action by the State Board of Education.

Limitations

This report addresses the state's overall allocation of time for the school day/school year and the effect of its assignment of tasks to be completed within that overall allocation. It does not address such issues as the ways and means to use the available school time most efficiently (e.g., for instruction, inservice training, etc.), and the various approaches to scheduling within the required school day/school year. Much information is available concerning these issues and their potential for improving the use of time in school is such that a preliminary recommendation related to the use of time in school has been included in this report.

Finally, the report does not address the varied and often important issues which arise from the administration and interpretation of the current school day/school year mandate. Such issues are more expeditiously resolved through the use of other specialized administrative resources and procedures of the State Board of Education.

HISTORICAL REVIEW AND ANALYSIS

Time and Achievement

In the course of its deliberations the National Commission on Excellence commissioned a paper by Donald B. Holsinger to review time, content and expectations as predictors of achievement. Holsinger extensively reviewed research studies conducted by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement which had analyzed student achievement in the United States and 21 other countries. In his report he states:

> We could find no other characteristic of the school systems of the different countries which showed anything like the same strength of association with test scores as did the sheer time given to instruction and the related variable of opportunity to learn. More emphasis in the curriculum and more time spent on the subject, as measured in years of exposure and hours of work, are the key to higher achievement in international competition.

Time, to be sure, is not the only factor to be considered in enhancing achievement. Numerous studies have demonstrated that family background, curriculum content, style of teaching and intensity of learning activities are among the contributors to student achievement. However, as Holsinger also notes -

> From the (International Association) data alone we would conclude that if national educational planners and policy makers wished to do one thing which would have high probability of improving national averages in a certain subject, they should give that subject strong emphasis in the curriculum and encourage teachers to devote as much time as possible to it in the classroom.

Achievement: A Higher Priority

Throughout the past century teachers and others complained in growing numbers, as they did in 1872, that the time available was not sufficient for the task. Long heard and little listened to, the question of time for education needed two major public issues to bring it once again to the forefront of public scrutiny. Those issues, the purposes of schooling and declining student achievement, grew rapidly to state and national attention in the seventies and early eighties. The proliferation of services and instructional areas gave rise to a reconsideration of the purposes of schooling. Fueled in part by economic considerations and in part by public demands for increased accountability and efficiency, the public concern over the purposes of schooling was given a major boost by the national attention given to numerous studies purporting to document the lack of American literacy in language (including foreign languages) and low achievement in mathematics, science, fine arts, and social studies.

The Evolution of Time Requirements in Illinois

The length of the school day and the school year have been part of state law for more than 150 years. The first such laws (adopted between 1865-75) were contained in the charters enacted for each school district. One such charter specified that "the board of education shall make the necessary provisions for continuing said schools in operation not less than 9 months nor more than 10 months in each year."

In 1889, state law set school year requirements according to the number of people residing in a given school district. Districts with less than 1,000 inhabitants were required to operate schools for "at least 110 days of actual teaching, in each year..." Districts with a population between 1,000 and 100,000 were required "to establish and support free schools not less than 6 nor more than 10 months per year." The state's compulsory attendance statute at that time required that "every person having under his control a child between the ages of 7 and 14 years, shall annually cause such child to attend for at least 16 weeks, at least 8 weeks of which attendance shall be consecutive...." The cumulative effect of these requirements was that the amount of schooling available to students depended upon where they lived.

The school year laws were later revised to require additional time. By 1943, schools were required to be in session at least 7 months and students were required to attend throughout this period. Distinctions made on the basis of district size were retained, with districts serving a population of less than 1,000 required to keep their schools in session at least 8 months.

In 1923 the state legislature for the first time required schools to provide a minimum of 4 hours of class work per day. It is clear that the time required reflected the status quo and protected it rather than increasing the time to be made available. It was not until 1959 that all districts were required to have a common school term of at least 9 months or 176 days of actual pupil attendance and a common school day of at least 5 hours of school work.

Although it is possible to follow the legislative development of the school day and school year, it is virtually impossible to identify the reasons for these decisions. No records of the legislative debates were kept and the early reports of the State Superintendents did not address why distinctions were made on the basis of population size, and why six months was considered the minimum school term or four hours the minimum school day.

Early Indications of Time Pressure

In 1845, Illinois law provided that "every school shall be for instruction in the branches of education prescribed in the qualifications for teachers." This meant, as defined elsewhere in the statutes, language arts ("orthography, reading in English, penmanship, and English grammar"), American history and geography, and arithmetic. In 1872, the list was expanded to include "elements of natural science, physiology and laws of health." It is interesting to observe that as early as 1872 there was concern about the amount of time available. When the legislature added the requirements to teach natural science, physiology and health, many teachers

complained that there was not enough time to teach these subjects. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction responded with a lengthy written discussion about how the school program might be conducted more efficiently in order to make the necessary time available, "...keeping in mind, of course, that (for the natural sciences) the merest rudiments are contemplated."

From 1865 to 1959 the time schools were actually in session each day and each year moved from being variable to being equal or very close to the state requirement. During the last decades of the 19th century, the Illinois school term hovered around 150-155 days; during the first two decades of the 20th century, it had moved to 171 days; and by 1924, it had jumped another level to 183 days. The length of the school day appears to have stabilized at approximately one hour above the statutory minimum of four hours of instruction by the mid-1950's.

Between 1872 and 1959, there was continuous and often successful pressure for expansion of the responsibilities assigned to schools. In 1889, the first special-interest legislation was enacted: a requirement that schools provide instruction on the abusive nature of alcoholic drinks and other narcotics. This law was later expanded to require instruction for a specific amount of time in that subject each day (at one point the law was amended to dictate the number of textbook pages to be covered) . During the early 1900's, the schools were also given responsibility for manual or vocational education, for instruction in morals and nutrition, and for expanded instruction regarding the American system of governance. During the 1930's and 40's, the schools were given the tasks of providing safety education, kindergarten, and instruction in patriotism.

While adding to the tasks of schooling, the state did not simultaneously add to the time required for schooling. Instead, it first urged more efficient use of time and later, in a practice which continues to this day, it merely required that portions of existing school time be earmarked for special purposes which usually were not related to the traditional core of instruction.

While the school day/school year had stabilized by the mid-1950's, the number of tasks had not. Concern about the expanding tasks of schooling was expressed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction in a 1958 publication which directed that "...schools are required not to permit things of secondary importance to weaken the school day nor year." Nevertheless, provided with a prescribed amount of time by the state into which the state continued to put more responsibilities, the schools responded by tinkering with the length and number of periods that would fit the tasks into the prescribed day.

The Evolving System

During the seven decades from 1889 to 1959 the Illinois public school system, ever a mirror of its social, political and economic environment, was transformed by successive waves of change. These decades witnessed the demise of the 19th century assumption that a common school education meant in practice an elementary school education, and saw the rise of new expectations of schools and students.

It can be seen that by 1959 the purposes of schooling had evolved to encompass four major areas. Using John Goodlad's terms and in roughly chronological order, the four broad purposes of schooling were to provide for the academic, cultural, vocational and personal development of students.

1959-1983

New Time

In 1959, the growing pressure of expanding responsibilities for schooling contributed to passage of new laws to require a minimum of 185 days (with a minimum of 176 days for instruction of students) and a minimum school day of 5 clock hours of supervised instruction. Former Representative Charles Clabaugh, a prominent legislator of the time who was interested in educational matters, has indicated that these changes were made in response to concern that the amount of time in school was being whittled down.

The 1959 law, (Section 18-8(c) of The School Code), provides that: "Days of attendance by pupils shall be counted only for sessions of not less than 5 clock hours of school work per day under direct supervision of teachers. . . ." In subsequent sections, the law provided exceptions for part-time pupils, opening and closing days, forced use of daily multiple sessions, inservice training days, and so forth.

Section 10-19 requires that "Each school board shall annually prepare a calendar for the school term, specifying the opening and closing dates and providing a minimum term of at least 185 days to insure 176 days of actual pupil attendance. . ."Certain permissible alternatives, based on local district initiative, are also contained in Sections 10-19 and 10-19.1 allowing for high school experimental programs and full year school plans; these alternatives are virtually unused . (See appendices for copy of the statutes.)

With only minor modifications, the 1959 law remains the mandate on time for schooling, and represents the state's only addition of time for schooling in this century.

An examination of Illinois law, and those of other states, on required school days and school year produced the following conclusions.

-- There is a marked similarity across the states regarding the minimum number of hours and days that schools are to be open and pupils are to attend. (see appendices for selected data).

-- These requirements have shown great stability over time in that substantial changes have not been enacted in most states for at least the past quarter century.

In short, the Illinois school day and school year have been substantially in concert with the rest of the nation.

New Work for Schools

Among the new or expanded mandates added by the state to those which had accumulated in preceding years were the following:

Safety Education	Vocational Education
Consumer Education	Career Education
Health Education	Conservation Education
Foreign Languages	Art and Music
Metric Education	Bilingual Education
Special Education	Media programs and services

While some were time specific (e.g., "30 clock hours" or "not less than nine weeks") and others were not, they all resulted in the available time having to be reallocated for schools and students. Some mandates were for elementary levels (K-8), some for secondary and some across all grade levels.

During the past two decades, there have been substantial increases in ancillary services provided as the schools came to be seen as an irresistibly convenient place to address societal problems whether or not they were part of the schools' commonly understood major purposes.

The services include a broad range of counseling (academic, vocational, career, personal development), diagnostic services, work experiences, internships, and testing (other than coursework tests). These services are frequently conducted on a "pull-out" basis, meaning that the student is required to leave regular school work in order to participate. While there are no data to pinpoint the amount of time used in this manner, it is recognized as a common practice at all grade levels and does in fact encroach on time that could otherwise be used for instruction.

Ancillary instruction programs include areas such as family life education, civic responsibilities, drug and alcohol abuse, social behavior, and leisure/recreation. Schools have developed elective courses as well as "pull-out" methods to provide these expected services.

Additional mandates and other services have not been the only changes in conditions that have had an effect on time. There has been extraordinary growth in content to be learned in subject areas. Consider just one example: the formal classification of mathematics has grown from twelve subdivisions and thirty-eight subcategories in 1868 to sixty subdivisions and approximately 3,400 subcategories in 1979. From a different perspective - and using a form the reader may add to from personal experience - consider the expansion in subject content and concepts from: Johann Sebastian Bach to Igor Stravinsky; Charles Dickens to James Joyce; Isaac Newton to Albert Einstein; and from Charles Babbage to Marvin Minsky. In the field of political geography, the reader is invited to guess how many countries-not to mention their capitals-are now part of that subject. (See appendices).

Finally, demands on school time increased as new areas of curriculum development were identified. The most recent is the technology phenomenon which has resulted in virtually every school district adding some form of computer awareness or application to its curriculum. A broad spectrum of the student population is affected since the applications sweep across vocational as well as academic preparation.

Consequences for the School Day

While the relationships to time differed among the mandates, there was one common element - in order for schools to provide them and students to take them, time had to be used differently than it was before they were required. Necessarily it became a problem of displacement; new programs and services had to be added at the expense of the time previously available to those already in place.

One example of displacement occurred when the topics of health, physical and safety education came into the schools' curriculum. They were permitted by the state to be provided as a single area with three components. How much time was displaced depended on local decisions, as the state merely recommended a balance of total time among the various school requirements. In 1964 the recommended total time per week (grades 1-8) for these three topics ranged from 1.5 to 3.3 hours. In time, with other changes, each of these topics acquired a state mandated block of time (e.g., daily physical education, and generally separate comprehensive health, safety and driver education courses), thus producing a further level of instructional time displacement.

On the whole high schools now provide, and their students spend, more than the required 5 clock hours in school. The common practice in Illinois high schools is that a student will take courses within a school day in which instruction is delivered for approximately 6 hours (data taken from the 1981-82 "Census of Secondary School Course Offerings and Enrollments"). Students, however, may not receive this much actual supervised instruction. Even within that day, which is not assured to every student in Illinois since it exceeds the state minimum, the sheer volume of change which has occurred undoubtedly results in reducing the time assumed to be needed to accomplish the basic purposes of schooling.

A recent survey of five regions throughout the state indicates that elementary schools are averaging about 5 1/2 hours per day, slightly less than the statewide average of nearly 6 hours for high schools. There are also indications that some districts have shortened school days somewhat in recent years in response to declining resources.

Finally, it has been noted that schools in the early part of this century were already operating somewhat beyond the 1923 state minimum of 4 hours. It appears that when the hours were increased to reflect that norm and establish the new minimum of 5 hours, the schools by and large tended to maintain rather than significantly extend their daily hours of instruction beyond the state minimum. The long standing practice of manipulating time within the school day continued to be the method of choice for accommodating new tasks.

Consequences for Students

The distribution of instructional/learning activities within the school day illustrates the impact of changing tasks and displacement of time for schooling.

The Census of Secondary School Course Offerings (1981-82) provides data reported by over 98% of Illinois' public high schools.

The analysis shows, for 1981-82, that about 71% of the total instruction delivered is spent in the six areas of language arts, mathematics, science, social sciences, fine arts, and physical development and health. The proportion of all instruction delivered in each learning area is shown below in descending order of time used. The statistics indicate that almost twice as much instructional time is devoted to physical education and health as is devoted to science (i.e., there are more classes and students in p.e./health than in science).

	Percent of Average Instructional Day
Physical Education and Health	17.2%
Language Arts	16.6%
Mathematics	10.7%
Social Sciences	10.6%
Science	8.9%
Fine Arts	6.6%
Total	70.6%

Within the same six areas of instruction, the proportion of instruction devoted to each area is shown below.

Area	Percent of Total Time Used for all 6 Areas
Physical Education and Health	24%
Language Arts	24%
Mathematics	15%
Social Sciences	15%
Science	13%
Fine Arts	9%
TOTAL	100%

On the average, half of all courses offered by high schools are in the six areas noted above.

The remaining areas in which students are enrolled are in vocational and occupational related courses, foreign languages, special education, safety and driver education, consumer-related areas and interdisciplinary studies. These areas consume about 29% of the total instructional time scheduled and available to students.

In summary the Census of Course Offerings for the 1981-82 school year shows the following:

1. When students selected their courses for 1981-82, about half of the courses available for selection were in the six areas previously noted and half were in other areas.

2. In the typical 6 hour day of scheduled instruction, almost 30% of the instructional time was in areas other than the six areas.

3. Physical education and health was the area which consumed the most scheduled instructional time.

4. Some areas show a broad range of courses available and taken, but have relatively few enrolled students (e.g. fine arts and foreign languages), while others show a narrow scope of courses and have substantial student participation (e.g. physical education and health).

5. While the typical day of scheduled instruction spans 6 hours, students are likely to have actual supervised instruction for less than that time.

Although a database similar to the Census of Course Offerings is not available for Illinois' public elementary schools there are other sources from which generalizations about the amount and use of time can be drawn.

From studies cited by Caldwell, Huitt and Graeber ("Time Spent in Learning: Implications from Research", The Elementary School Journal; May 1982; Vol. 82; No. 5), it is apparent that elementary schools vary widely in the amount of academic learning time made available to students. Based on analysis of a number of research studies, the authors classified the time needed as low average, average, and high average in order to make general observations and comparisons. While the studies cited are not specific to Illinois nor to any other single location it is reasonable to assert that Illinois practices (as well as other states') very likely fall within the range of differences drawn from the studies because of the similarity of the tasks and the overall time available for instruction.

The authors show for reading/language arts that daily instructional time ranges from 90 minutes (low average), to 2 hours (average), to 2 1/2 hours (high average). For mathematics the parallel figures are 30 minutes, 45 minutes and 60 minutes. In the aggregate, students in a high average situation have over 25% more learning time available for these two areas than those in an average situation (595 hours per year versus 440 hours), and 75% more than those in a low average situation (595 hours per year versus 300 hours).

Language arts and mathematics are subjects to be found close to the top of any list of the purposes of schooling and close to the top of any list of priorities for desired student achievement. In this context, the significance of the data given above on how students spend their school day and how varied their exposure to these two essential subjects may be within the school day becomes clear. Students spend significant proportions of time in areas other than the fundamental subjects, and even within the fundamental subjects the instructional time available to students may vary by up to 75%.

Time, Tasks and Achievement

In short, the period since 1959 has been one of great change, highlighted by the emergence of a bewildering array of special interest groups which shared a common belief in the efficacy of education as an instrument for social change. And their belief was expressed through the introduction of large numbers of new instructional and educational service priorities. Throughout the period, only one major element remained static: the time required for instruction. And the process of displacement, caused by the changes which occurred, will continue as new and often laudable proposals come to light. (Just this year a requirement for "parenting education" was suggested.)

As noted at the outset of this historical review and analysis, the priority for today - and the future as well - is a new emphasis on student achievement; specifically, student achievement in disciplines virtually identical to those identified as the purpose of schools over a century ago. If we are to provide this new emphasis, we must learn from our past. Time for teaching and learning in the areas we hold most important must be increased and protected from encroachment.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Each of the mandates studied by the State Board of Education has utilized the five questions which comprise the framework for analysis included in the Board's mandate study plan. These questions, and a response to each as it concerns the school day/school year mandates, are presented below.

1. What desirable condition or outcome is called for by the mandates?

The explicit condition and outcome called for by these mandates is that all public schools shall provide school work for the minimum daily and annual periods of instruction specified in the statutes. Thus the desired outcome is clearly a minimum and uniformly available amount of time considered by the state to be necessary for education. That the state considers compliance with these minima to be a very high priority is indicated by the fact that the extent of compliance with them affects the level of financial aid a school district is entitled to claim from the state.

It is clear from the stability of these mandates that the state's assumption is that the amounts of time required have been and are now of a quantity sufficient to enable the schools to perform the tasks required and expected of them. The evidence on school practice and student achievement indicates the assumption is not warranted.

2. Is there evidence that in the absence of the mandate the condition or outcome will not be achieved?

The presence of these mandates in Illinois and of similar laws in virtually every other state make it difficult to predict with precision the consequences of their elimination. At the same time it is highly unlikely that leaving such decisions to over one thousand Illinois school districts will result in a reasonably uniform provision of time now or in the future. The more likely result, based on the evidence of current school practices, is that local school day/school year lengths would become unstable and begin to reflect the dramatically different amounts of instructional time made available within the school day noted earlier in this report (i.e., 595 hours per year versus 300 hours per year in language arts and mathematics.)

3. As presently defined does (can) the mandate yield the desired result?

No, not now or in the foreseeable future because:

a) If the legislative intent in adding time in 1959 was an effort to provide and protect time for instruction in certain subjects (Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, etc.) about which these statutes were and are silent, then it largely failed because from the outset that time has been used for a variety of other purposes as well.

b) The desired condition of providing reasonably equal levels of instruction throughout the state has been seriously undermined as districts able to find the resources responded to the state's added

mandates and other public demands by lengthening the school day or diluting instructional offerings, while those with fewer resources were left with dilution as their only choice in the face of increased demands.

c) In 1983 and for the future, the present allocation of time is clearly inadequate in view of the required tasks and the performance expected of schools. In brief, schools are now required to maintain instructional and non-instructional service levels, to maintain or increase services to special populations, to maintain and increase student enrollment and retention rates, to meet emerging societal needs, and to do so while raising the level of student achievement with a state resource allocation of time unchanged since 1959.

4. Could the mandates be defined and/or implemented differently and yield the desired result?

Yes. There are three general alternatives, each of which is discussed separately below, although it is recognized that combinations are possible.

a. Refining the Goals and Tasks of Schooling

Pro: Public education has reached a stage where it might well be called Mission Impossible. Increasingly its mission has been transformed into that of providing community services, family services, special interest services and instruction, and all-purpose message center for society's alarums. Perhaps unwittingly, the state has been reducing the amount of time available for the instructional center of education for decades. It is past time to relieve the pressure, clarify the mission so that it becomes possible, and thereby enhance the possibility of meeting the widespread demand for higher student achievement in what is now taught and what is likely to be taught in the future.

The state must define the core of academic instruction. The record of the past, the recommendations of national studies of education today, and the demands of tomorrow all point toward the need to adopt an academic core of instruction which includes Language Arts, Foreign Language, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies, including History.

Con: Public education is the most flexible institution government commands for the resolution of its concerns and the preparation of successive generations. The institution has grown commensurate with its mission. Its services to students, parents, the community and the state are very largely those which will enhance educational achievement, or reduce educational failure. The major tasks of education have not been assigned capriciously, but only after extended and often vigorous public debate, which has documented the problem and the capacity of education for contributing to the solution. The answer is not to do less, but to do better.

b. Extend the School Year

Pro: The traditional school year is a classic example of displaced priorities. Students vary in the instructional time they require for a given level of performance in a given subject (let alone across subjects). Time for education is not set solely in response to learning or instructional considerations - rather it reflects accommodation to the traditional tourism cycles, educational practice and agricultural production. It is sheer folly to shut down entire systems merely because some of their clients are not present at a given point in time.

Con: One of government's less attractive characteristics is its propensity to recognize that a serious problem exists, to determine to do something about it and then to do too little to produce an appreciable effect. It is then likely to conclude that the treatment (rather than its quantity) is wrong and to stop providing it.

Such is likely to be the case in extending the school year. That is, not enough days will be added to produce an appreciable effect. Further, as noted earlier in this report, extending the school year in order to increase instructional time is significantly less powerful than extending the school day. This option will be deceptively attractive because one speaks in days rather than hours and thus it will appear to produce more instruction than in fact will be the case. It must also be recognized that however irrational the current school year may appear to be it is a deeply embedded tradition in our society and highly resistant to change, as indicated by the general failure of the year-round school movement in Illinois and elsewhere. It should be a last rather than a first alternative.

c. Extend the School Day

Pro: The minimum day for "school work" is five clock hours, or 300 minutes. Each 30 minutes of increase adds 10% to the day's available learning time. Increases of 1 or 2 hours would provide for jumps of 20% and 40%.

The cumulative effect of adding one hour to each school day without changing the number of days is that it is the equivalent of adding 35.2 days to the school year. To approximate this increased opportunity for learning by changing the number of days and not the number of hours per day would require a minimum attendance of approximately 211 days. Thus, the cumulative effect of a modest increase in time on a daily basis is quite significant.

The state has an obligation to bring into reasonable balance the demands it places on schools and the resources of time it requires them to provide. Time is a resource which the state may use to reduce the current imbalance and to establish

conditions more conducive to enhancing achievement than is presently the case. Moreover, as noted earlier in this report time is generally positively associated in the research literature with achievement. In the present circumstances the minimum time required is simply too low in relation to the overall tasks and performance expected of schools and their students.

Con: This is another example of a hallowed bureaucratic tradition: responding to criticism by demanding more of everything - more time, more money, more personnel. Provision of more time for education should follow, not precede, convincing evidence that the present resources are being used effectively, efficiently and to the maximum extent feasible, and that additional resources will, not might, produce increased results.

5. Does the Mandate reflect a compelling state interest?

Yes. Since education is a state responsibility, determining the time to be made available for it should be done in a manner which provides students with resources and benefits of an adequate level and in a reasonably equitable manner. Because there can be little assurance that equitable results will occur on a statewide basis through granting autonomy for the length of the school day/school year to over one thousand local school districts, the state has a compelling interest in mandating the conditions it views as minimally necessary to the execution of its responsibilities for education.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based upon the evidence which has been presented in this report.

- Schools in Illinois, on the average, already exceed the minimum 5 clock hours daily for instruction;

- Changes in state and federal mandates and public expectations over the years have dramatically increased pressures for the reallocation of time within the school day;

- Allocation of instructional time in high schools is disproportionate among selected instructional areas and may not reflect either state or locally preferred priorities;

- Allocation of instructional time in elementary schools may result in serious learning opportunity gaps among students due to local scheduling.

- The time deemed adequate to perform the tasks of schooling in 1959 is not adequate to the demands of 1983 and beyond.

- The state should define the academic core of instruction as consisting of: Language Arts, Foreign Languages, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies, including History. Five hours of each school day should be preserved for instruction in these disciplines*and two hours should be added to the school day to accommodate such other instruction and service as may be deemed necessary through state or local determination.

*This conclusion does not mean that we should include foreign language as a required subject. It signifies, rather, that it may be included in the five hour period if schools offering the subject choose to do so.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

The State Board of Education should adopt the motions necessary to support the following legislative and administrative actions.

1. Amend The School Code to require that students receive supervised instruction for five hours each day in one or more of these academic areas: Language Arts, Foreign Languages, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies, including History.* And further, to require the provision of at least two additional hours each day to be used for the purposes of providing other instruction and services deemed necessary through state or local determination.

2. Upon final adoption by the State Board of Education of a definition of schooling and its related outcome statements pursue any further amendments needed to assure the continued preservation of the instructional day for the primary purposes of schooling at a level adequate to the scope of the instructional tasks and expected outcomes.

3. Direct the State Superintendent to develop as a major priority the resources needed to provide information and assistance to local school districts seeking to identify ways to use school time more efficiently and effectively for students and teachers and to make this information and assistance widely available.

0463j

*See footnote on page 19.

Selected References

Andringa, Robert. "Action for Excellence," Education Commission of the States Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, June 1983.

Bailey, Adrienne. "Academic Preparation for College: What Students Should Know and Be Able to Do," The College Board, June 1983.

Boyer, Ernest L. "High School - A Report on Secondary Education in America," The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton, New Jersey, September 1983.

Caldwell, Janet H., William G. Huitt, and Anna O. Graeber. "Time Spent in Learning: Implications from Research," The Elementary School Journal, Volume 82, May 1982, pp. 471-480.

Census of Secondary School Course Offerings, Illinois State Board of Education, 1976-77 and 1981-82.

Davis, Philip J., and Reuben Hersh. The Mathematical Experience, Birkhauser Boston, Mass. 1981.

"Educating Americans for the 21st Century: A Plan of Action for Improving Mathematics, Science and Technology Education for All American Elementary and Secondary Students so that their Achievement is the Best in the World by 1995," National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology, National Science Foundation News, September 1983.

Eisner, Elliot W. "The Impoverished Mind," Educational Leadership, May 1978.

Fredrick, Wayne C., and Herbert J. Walberg. "Learning as a Function of Time," The Journal of Educational Research, Volume 73, March/April 1980, pp. 183-194.

Giertz, J. Fred. "A Benefit-Cost Framework for Evaluating an Extended School Day." Unpublished report. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Goldberg, Milton. "A Nation at Risk," Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, April 1983.

Goodlad, John I. A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future, Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, Inc., 1983.

Hofstadter, Douglas R. Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid, Vintage Books, September 1980.

Hofstadter, Douglas R., and Daniel C. Dennett. The Mind's I: Fantasies and Reflections on Self and Soul, Basic Books, New York, 1981.

Holsinger, Donald B. "Time, Content and Expectations as Predictors of School Achievement in the USA and Other Developed Countries: A Review of IEA Evidence," National Commission on Excellence in Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., September 1982.

Huber, Joan. "Homes Unoccupied by Day: Causes and Consequences." Unpublished report. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Illinois Program for Evaluation, Supervision, and Recognition of Schools, Circular Series A, No. 160, The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield, Illinois, 1964.

Instructional Program Mandates: A Preliminary Report, Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield, Illinois, September 1982.

Illinois Revised Statutes, 1983, Chapter 122, Secs. 10-19 et seq. and Sec. 18-8A et seq.

Ninth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1871-1872. Department of Public Instruction, Springfield, Illinois, December 1872.

Peterson, Paul. "Making the Grade," Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy, May 1983.

Phillips, Deborah. "Psychological Perspectives on the Length of the School Day/Year." Unpublished report. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Proposed Action Plan to Improve Elementary and Secondary Education Results in New York, Elementary, Secondary and Continuing Education, New York Department of Education, August 1983.

Roehler, Laura, William Schmidt, and Margaret Buchmann. How Do Teachers Spend Their Language Arts Time? Institute for Research in Teaching, Michigan State University, 1981.

Sewall, Gilbert T. "Vocational Education That Works," Fortune, September 19, 1983, pp. 68-78.

Stallings, Jane. "Findings from the Research in Teaching: What We Have Learned." Paper presented at a conference sponsored by the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory, Snowmass, Colorado, July 1983.

The Illinois Program for Evaluation, Supervision and Recognition of Schools, State Board of Education Document Number One, October 1977.

The World Factbook, Directorate of Intelligence, Central Intelligence Agency, May 1983.

Thurston, Paul W. "An Historical Examination of the School Day and School Calendar in Illinois.," Unpublished report. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign,

What's Noteworthy in School Improvement. Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory, Kansas City, Summer, 1981.

0463j

APPENDICES

- How Many Countries Are There in the World?
- Statutory and Regulatory References
- Selected Data on School Year/School Day

How Many Countries Are There in The World?

The answer depends on who is consulted.

For example:

- The Central Intelligence Agency lists 176 countries;
- The National Geographic Society informed us that it was either 176 or 178 depending on how East and West Germany and the Falkland Islands were treated; and
- The Illinois State Library listed 188 countries as of September 29, 1983.

A final note, according to the Association of Ancient Historians (Los Angeles, California), in 1872 there were 40-50 countries in the world.

0463j

used) of the district as such administrative district, in the form prescribed by the State Board of Education. The costs of publishing this separate statement prepared by such an administrative district shall be apportioned among and paid by the participating districts in the same manner as other costs and expenses accruing to those districts jointly.

School districts on a cash basis shall have prepared and publish a statement showing the cash receipts and disbursements by funds in the form prescribed by the State Board of Education.

School districts using the accrual system of accounting shall have prepared and publish a statement of revenue and expenses and a statement of financial position in the form prescribed by the State Board of Education.

In Class II county school units such statement shall be prepared and published by the township treasurer of the unit within which such districts are located.

In Class I or Class II counties the statement of school districts on either a cash or accrual basis shall show such other information as may be required by the State Board of Education, including:

1. Annual fiscal year gross payment for certificated personnel to be shown by name, listing each employee in one of the following categories:

(a) Under $10,000

(b) $10,000 to $16,999

(c) $17,000 to $24,999

(d) $25,000 and over

2. Annual fiscal year payment for non-certificated personnel to be shown by name, listing each employee in one of the following categories:

(a) Under $10,000

(b) $10,000 to $16,999

(c) $17,000 to $24,999

(d) $25,000 and over

3. In addition to wages and salaries all other moneys in the aggregate paid to recipients of $100 or more, giving the name of the person, firm or corporation and the total amount received by each.

4. Approximate size of school district in square miles.

5. Number of school attendance centers.

6. Numbers of employees as follows:

(a) Full-time certificated employees;

(b) Part-time certificated employees;

(c) Full-time non-certificated employees;

(d) Part-time non-certificated employees.

7. Numbers of pupils as follows:

(a) Enrolled by grades;

(b) Total enrolled;

(c) Average daily attendance;

8. Assessed valuation as follows:

(a) Total of the district;

(b) Per pupil in average daily attendance;

9. Tax rate for each district fund.

10. District financial obligation at the close of the fiscal year as follows:

(a) Teachers' orders outstanding;

(b) Anticipation warrants outstanding for each fund.

11. Total bonded debt at the close of the fiscal year.

12. Percent of bonding power obligated currently.

13. Value of capital assets of the district including:

(a) Land;

(b) Buildings;

(c) Equipment.

14. Total amount of investments each fund.

15. Change in net cash position from the previous report period for each district fund.

In addition to the above report, a report of expenditures in the aggregate paid on behalf of recipients of $100 or more, giving the name of the person, firm or corporation and the total amount received by each shall be available in the school district office for public inspection. This listing shall include all wages, salaries and expenditures over $100 expended from any revolving fund maintained by the district. Any resident of the school district may receive a copy of this report, upon request, by paying a reasonable charge to defray the costs of preparing such copy.

This Section does not apply to cities having a population exceeding 500,000.

Amended by P.A. 82-980, § 1, eff. Sept. 8, 1982.

10-18. Orders

§ 10-18. Orders. Every order issued by the school board shall state for what purposes or on what account it is issued, and shall be in the following form:

$..... State of Illinois, ..., 19....

THE TREASURER

(insert name)

Of School District No. ..... in ..... County,

Pay to the order of .....

the sum of ..... Dollars,

100

for .....

.....

.....

By order of the School Board of

District No. ....., in said County.

Order No. .....

..... President

..... Clerk (or Secretary)

An order paid in full and properly endorsed shall be a sufficient receipt for the purposes of this Act. The school board shall issue no order, except for teachers' wages, unless at the time there are sufficient funds in the hands of the treasurer to pay it.

10-19. Length of school term—Experimental programs

§ 10-19. Length of school term—experimental programs. Each school board shall annually prepare a calendar for the school term, specifying the opening and closing dates and providing a minimum term of at least 185 days to insure 176 days of actual pupil attendance, computable under Section 18-8, except that for the 1980-1981 school year only 175 days of actual pupil attendance shall be required because of the closing of schools pursuant to Section 24-2 on January 29, 1981 upon the appointment by the President of that day as a day of thanksgiving for the

freedom of the Americans who had been held hostage in Iran. Any days allowed by law for teachers' institute but not used as such shall increase the minimum term by the school days not so used. Except as provided in Section 10–19.1, the board may not extend the school term beyond such closing date unless that extension of term is necessary to provide the minimum number of computable days. In case of such necessary extension school employees shall be paid for such additional time on the basis of their regular contracts. A school board may specify a closing date earlier than that set on the annual calendar when the schools of the district have provided the minimum number of computable days under this Section. Nothing in this Section prevents the board from employing superintendents of schools, principals and other nonteaching personnel for a period of 12 months, or in the case of superintendents for a period in accordance with Section 10–23.8, or prevents the board from employing other personnel before or after the regular school term with payment of salary proportionate to that received for comparable work during the school term.

A school board may make such changes in its calendar for the school term as may be required by any changes in the legal school holidays prescribed in Section 24–2.

With the prior approval of the State Board of Education and subject to review by the State Board of Education every 3 years, any school board may, by resolution of its board, establish experimental educational programs at the high school level, including but not limited to programs for self-directed learning or outside of formal class periods, which programs when so approved shall be considered to comply with the requirements of this Section as respects numbers of days of actual pupil attendance and with the other requirements of this Act as respects courses of instruction.

Amended by P.A. 82–1, § 1, eff. March 31, 1981; P.A. 82–203, § 1, eff. Aug. 14, 1981.

P.A. 82–1, in the first sentence of the first paragraph, inserted the exception relating to the day of thanksgiving for the freedom of the Americans held hostage in Iran and days of fast or thanksgiving appointed by the Governor.

P.A. 82–203 incorporated the changes made by P.A. 82–1, and, in addition, deleted from the added exception the provision relating to days appointed for fasting or thanksgiving.

Final legislative action, 82nd General Assembly:

P.A. 82–1—March 26, 1981

P.A. 82–203—June 16, 1981

See Ill.Rev.Stat. ch. 1, ¶ 1105 as to the effect (1) more than one amendment of a section at the same session of the General Assembly or (2) two or more acts relating to the same subject matter enacted by the same General Assembly.

10–19.1. Full year school plan

§ 10–19.1. Full year school plan. Any school district may, by resolution of its board, operate one or more schools within the district on a full year school plan approved by the State Board of Education. Any board which operates under this Section shall devise a plan so that a student's required attendance in school shall be for a minimum term of 180 days of actual attendance, including not more than 4 institute days, during a 12 month period, but shall not exceed 185 days. Under such plan, no teacher shall be required to teach more than 185 days. A calendar of 180 days may be established with the approval of the State Board of Education.

Amended by P.A. 81–1508, § 13, eff. Sept. 25, 1980.

10–19.2. Full year feasibility study—Grant—Transitional expenditure reimbursement

§ 10–19.2. Full year feasibility study—grant—transitional expenditure reimbursement. Any school district, including special charter districts, may, by resolution of its board, file an application with the State Board of Education and, if approved, receive funds for the purpose of conducting a study of the feasibility of operating one or more schools within the district on a full year school plan pursuant to Section 10–19.1. Such feasibility study shall include, but need not be limited to, the educational program, building and space needs, administrative and personnel costs, pupil distribution in the district, community attitudes and transportation costs. The Board of Education of any district which conducts a feasibility study pursuant to this Section shall submit a final report to the State Board of Education upon completion of the study or within one year after receipt of funds, whichever occurs first.

School districts seeking State financial support to conduct feasibility studies shall file applications with the State Board of Education on forms provided by the State Board. The State Board of Education may grant or deny applications, in whole or in part, and provide the funds necessary to implement approved applications, provided that the total amount of funds necessary to implement approved applications does not exceed the annual appropriation for that purpose.

If, based upon the results of a full year feasibility study, a school district determines that it will operate one or more schools within the district in accordance with Section 10–19.1, the State Board of Education may, pursuant to guidelines established by the State Board, reimburse such district for expenditures resulting from making such transition, provided that no expenditure shall be reimbursed which would have been incurred by a school district in the absence of a changeover to a full year school program.

In the event any funds appropriated for transition reimbursement during any fiscal year are insufficient for that purpose, payment shall be made in the proportion that the total amount of such expenditures bears to the total amount of money available for payment.

Amended by P.A. 81–1508, § 13, eff. Sept. 25, 1980.

10–20. Duties of school board

§ 10–20. Duties of school board. The school board has the duties enumerated in Sections 10–20–1 through 10–20–30.

Amended by P.A. 78–255, § 61, eff. Oct. 1, 1973.

10–20.1. Records to be retained

§ 10–20.1. Records to be retained. To maintain records to substantiate all district claims for State aid in accordance with regulations prescribed by the State Board of Education and to retain such records for a period of three years.

Amended by P.A. 81–1508, § 13, eff. Sept. 25, 1980.

10–20.2. Report of teachers employed

§ 10–20.2. Report of teachers employed. To report to the county superintendent within ten days after their employment the names of all teachers employed, with the dates of the beginning and end of their contracts.

by the 15th day of December. Such payments shall be transmitted to the regional superintendent for the region in which each such district is located and the regional superintendent shall henceforth transmit such payments to the appropriate school treasurer. If the money appropriated by the General Assembly for such purpose for any year is insufficient, it shall be apportioned on the basis of claims approved.

However, notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, for the 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983 fiscal years, the money appropriated by the General Assembly for the purposes of this Section shall only be used for grants for approved summer school programs for those handicapped children served pursuant to Sections 14–7.02 and 14–7.02a of The School Code.

Amended by P.A. 81–95, § 1, eff. July 14, 1979; P.A. 81–1388, § 1, eff. Aug. 20, 1980.

P.A. 81–95, in the last paragraph, substituted "1980" for "1977, 1978 and 1979" and "year" for "years only".

P.A. 81–1388, in the last paragraph, inserted "1981, 1982 and 1983" and substituted "years" for "year".

Final legislative action, 81st General Assembly:

P.A. 81–95—June 7, 1979

P.A. 81–1388—June 23, 1980

See Ill.Rev.Stat. ch. 1, ¶ 1105 as to the effect of (1) more than one amendment of a section at the same session of the General Assembly or (2) two or more acts relating to the same subject matter enacted by the same General Assembly.

18–5. Compensation of regional superintendents and assistants

§ 18.5. Compensation of regional superintendents and assistants. The State Board of Education shall set aside semi-annually and pay into the State Treasury ½ of the aggregate of all amounts payable from the State school fund as and for compensation for regional superintendents of schools and the assistant regional superintendents of schools authorized by Section 3–15.10 of this Act, and as provided in "An Act concerning fees and salaries and to classify the several counties of this State with reference thereto", approved March 29, 1872 as amended,[1] and shall draw warrants upon the State Treasurer monthly for the payment to the several regional superintendents and such assistant regional superintendents of their compensation as fixed by law.

Amended by P.A. 82–638, § 1, eff. Sept. 24, 1981.

[1] Chapter 53, ¶ 1 et seq.

18–6. Supervisory expense fund

§ 18–6. Supervisory expense fund. The State Board of Education shall set aside semi-annually and pay into the State Treasury an amount from the State school fund as a county supervisory expense fund, aggregating $500 per county per half-year. He shall draw his warrants upon the State Treasurer monthly in the sum of $83.33, payable to the regional superintendent of schools in each region. Each regional superintendent of schools may draw upon this fund for the expenses necessarily incurred in providing for supervisory service in his region. On or before October 1 of each year, the regional superintendents of schools shall submit to the State Board of Education a certified statement of the expenditures made from this expense fund.

Amended by P.A. 82–638, § 1, eff. Sept. 24, 1981.

18–7. Payments for benefit of Teachers' Retirement System

§ 18–7. Payments for benefit of Teachers' Retirement System. Pursuant to computations of the State Board of Education, the State Board of Education shall pay for the benefit of the Teachers' Retirement System of the State of Illinois the semi-annual sum legally assigned to be paid from the common school fund for the benefit of the system as provided in Article 16 of the "Illinois Pension Code" [1] as the same may from time to time be amended. The portion of the common school fund apportioned to any school district not coming under the provisions of said system shall not, however, be diminished or affected by the provisions of this apportionment for said system. In transmitting warrants due the several regions on account of school district claims under Section 18–8 the State Board of Education shall notify the regional superintendent of schools of any region of the apportionment allotted to the region for the benefit of any school district not coming under the provisions of said system. The State Board of Education shall draw warrants upon the State Treasurer payable from the funds of said system upon the presentation of proper vouchers as provided by law.

Amended by P.A. 82–638, § 1, eff. Sept. 24, 1981.

[1] Chapter 108½, ¶ 16–101 et seq.

18–8. Basis for apportionment to districts and laboratory schools

§ 18–8. Basis for apportionment to districts and laboratory schools. A. The amounts to be apportioned shall be determined for each educational service region by school districts, as follows:

1. General Provisions: (a) In the computation of the amounts to be apportioned, the average daily attendance of all pupils in grades 9 through 12 shall be multiplied by 1.25. For the school year beginning July 1, 1982, and thereafter, the average daily attendance of all pupils in grades 7 and 8 shall be multiplied by 1.05.

(b) The actual number of pupils in average daily attendance shall be computed in a one-teacher school district by dividing the total aggregate days of pupil attendance by the actual number of days school is in session but not more than 30 such pupils shall be accredited for such type of district; and in districts of 2 or more teachers, or in districts where records of attendance are kept by session teachers, by taking the sum of the respective averages of the units composing the group.

(c) Pupils in average daily attendance shall be computed upon the average of the best 3 months of pupils attendance of the current school year except as district claims may be later amended as provided hereinafter in this Section. Days of attendance shall be kept by regular calendar months, except any days of attendance in August shall be added to the month of September and any days of attendance in June shall be added to the month of May. Days of attendance by pupils shall be counted only for sessions of not less than 5 clock hours of school work per day under direct supervision of teachers, with pupils of legal school age and in kindergarten and grades 1 through 12.

(d) Pupils regularly enrolled in a public school for only a part of the school day may be counted on the basis of ⅙ day for every class hour of instruction of 40 minutes or more attended pursuant to such enrollment.

(e) Days of attendance may be less than 5 clock hours on the opening and closing of the school term, and upon the first day of pupil attendance, if preceded by a day or days utilized as an institute or teachers' workshop.

(f) A session of 4 of more clock hours may be counted as a day of attendance upon certification by the regional superintendent, and approved by the State Superintendent of Education to the ex'ent that the district has been forced to use daily multiple sessions.

(g) A session of 3 or more clock hours may be counted as a day of attendance when the remainder of the school day is utilized for an in-service training program for teachers, up to a maximum of 5 days per school year of which a maximum of 4 days of such 5 days may be used for parent-teacher conferences, provided a district conducts an in-service training program for teachers which has been approved by the State Superintendent of Education; or, in lieu of 4 such days, 2 full days may be devoted to parent-teacher conferences, in which event each such day may be counted as a day of attendance. Any days so used shall not be considered for computing average daily attendance.

(h) A session of not less than 1 clock hour teaching of hospitalized or homebound pupils on-site or by telephone to the classroom may be counted as ½ day of attendance, however these pupils must receive 4 or more clock hours of instruction to be counted for a full day of attendance.

(i) A session of at least 4 clock hours may be counted as a day of attendance for first grade pupils, and a session of 2 or more hours may be counted as ½ day of attendance by kindergarten pupils.

(j) For handicapped children below the age of 6 years who cannot attend two or more clock hours because of handicap or immaturity, a session of not less than one clock hour may be counted as ½ day of attendance; however for such children whose educational needs so require a session of 4 or more clock hours may be counted as a full day of attendance.

(k) A recognized kindergarten shall not have more than ½ day of attendance counted in any 1 day. However, kindergartens may count 2½ days of attendance in any 5 consecutive school days. Where a kindergarten pupil attends school for 2 half days on any one school day, such pupil shall have the following day as a day absent from school, unless the school district obtains permission in writing from the State Superintendent of Education. Only the first year of attendance in one kindergarten shall be counted except in case of children who entered the kindergarten in their fifth year whose educational development requires a second year of kindergarten as determined under the rules and regulations of the State Board of Education.

(l) Days of attendance by tuition pupils shall be accredited only to the districts that pay the tuition to a recognized school.

(m) For the school year beginning July 1, 1979, the greater of the weighted average daily attendance for the 1978–79 school year or the average of the weighted average daily attendance for the 1977–78 and 1978–79 school years shall be used to compute the State aid entitlement. For any school year beginning July 1, 1980, or thereafter, the greater of the immediately preceding year's weighted average daily attendance or the average of the weighted average daily attendance of the immediately preceding year and the previous 2 years shall be used.

For the school year beginning July 1, 1982, those districts using an average of their weighted average daily attendance under the provisions of this subsection shall use the average of the best 3 months of pupil attendance for the 1981–82 school year and the average of the best 6 months for the previous 2 years. For the school year beginning July 1, 1983, the average of the best 3 months for the 1981–82 and 1982–83 school years and the average of the best 6 months for the 1980–81 school year shall be used.

(n) The number of pupils in a district listed as eligible under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965[1] shall result in an increase in the weighted average daily attendance calculated as follows: The number of pupils eligible under Title I shall increase the weighted ADA by .53 for each student adjusted by dividing the percent of pupils eligible for Title I in the district by the ratio of pupils eligible for Title I in the State to the best 6 months' weighted average daily attendance in the State. In no case may the adjustment under this paragraph result in a greater weighting than .625 per eligible Title I student.

(o) Any school district which fails for any given school year to maintain school as required by law, or to maintain a recognized school is not eligible to file for such school year any claim upon the common school fund. In case of nonrecognition of one or more attendance centers in a school district otherwise operating recognized schools, the claim of the district shall be reduced in the proportion which the average daily attendance in the attendance center or centers bear to the average daily attendance in the school district. A "recognized school" means any public school which meets the standards as established for recognition by the State Board of Education. A school district or attendance center not having recognition status at the end of a school term is entitled to receive State aid payments due upon a legal claim which was filed while it was recognized.

(p) School district claims filed under this Section are subject to Sections 18–9, 18–10 and 18–12, except as herein otherwise provided.

(q) The State Board of Education shall secure from the Department of Revenue the value as equalized or assessed by the Department of Revenue of all taxable property of every school district together with the applicable tax rate used in extending taxes for the funds of the district as of September 30 of the previous year. In a new district which has not had any tax rates yet determined for extension of taxes, a leveled uniform rate shall be computed from the latest amount of the fund taxes extended on the several areas within such new district.

(r) If a school district operates a full year school under Section 10–19.1 of this Act, the general state aid to the school district shall be determined by the State Board of Education in accordance with this Section as near as may be applicable.

2. Limit in annual increases: For the school year beginning July 1, 1978, a district may not have an entitlement in excess of a 35% increase over the prior year's entitlement as adjusted for weighted ADA excluding ESEA–Title I weightings, but may in subsequent years continue to receive 35% increases until the district is reimbursed the full amount of the annual entitlement.

3. Supplementary claim: Any newly organized school district, any district that has annexed a district or any portion of a district, and any district that has had a detachment of territory shall file a supplementary state aid claim on forms provided by the State Board of Education.

4. Impaction. Impaction payments shall be made as provided for in Section 18–4.2 of this Act.

5. Summer school. Summer school payments shall be made as provided in Section 18–4.3 of this Act.

From Chapter 4 of The Illinois Program for Evaluation, Supervision, and Recognition of Schools Document 1

4-2.7 The School Code of Illinois in Sections 10-19 and 18-8 specifies certain measures relative to the school day. Any deviation from this section of The School Code of Illinois enumerated below will be examined on an individual basis by the Illinois Office of Education, Public School Approval Section. A summary of The School Code of Illinois, Section 18-8 indicates: Every school system shall operate its schools a minimum of five clock-hours of school work each day with the following exceptions:

a. Four clock-hours may be counted as a day of attendance for first-grade pupils.

b. Two clock-hours may be counted as a half-day of attendance by kindergarten pupils. A recognized kindergarten shall not have more than one half-day of attendance counted in any one day. However, kindergartens may count two and one-half days of attendance in any five consecutive school days. Where a kindergarten pupil attends school for two half-days on any one school day, such pupil shall have the following day as a day absent from school, unless the school system obtains permission in writing from the State Superintendent of Education.

c. One clock-hour may count as one half-day of attendance for handicapped children below the age of six years who cannot attend a two-hour session because of handicap or immaturity.

d. Days of attendance may be less than five clock-hours on the opening and closing day of the school term, and upon the second or third day of the school term if the first and second days are utilized as an institute or teachers' workshop. Four clock-hours may be counted as a day of attendance upon certification by the Regional Superintendent and approved by the State Superintendent of Education to the extent that the district has been forced to use daily multiple sessions. (Approval will be granted on the basis of the present facilities being inadequate to house a normal program.)

Approval to count a session of four to five clock-hours as a day in session shall be granted by the State Superintendent of Education upon certification of the district's plans by the Regional Superintendent. The request shall be made prior to the opening of the school year to be used, shall include a copy of the official board of education minutes indicating board approval of the plan, shall include provision for remedying the situation that caused the request, and shall include a daily schedule showing each student will, in fact, be in class at least four clock-hours. Requests for extensions shall be made by the district annually prior to the opening of school.

e. A session of three or more clock-hours up to a maximum of five half-days per school year may be counted as a full day of attendance when the remainder of the day is utilized for an inservice training program for teachers. Two full days may be used for parent-teacher conferences. Any full day used reduces the number of allowable half-days by two. In either instance, the programs shall have prior approval on forms supplied by the Illinois Office of Education, Public School Approval Section.

f. Any deviation from the five clock-hour requirement as it pertains to student attendance will be evaluated on an individual basis by the Illinois Office of Education, Public School Approval Section.

4-2.8 Each school board shall annually prepare a calendar for the school term, specifying the opening and closing dates and providing a minimum term of at least 185 days to insure 176 days of actual pupil attendance, computable under Section 18-8 of The School Code of Illinois. Any days allowed by law for teachers' institute but not used as such shall increase the minimum term by the school days not so used. Except as provided in Section 10-19.1 of The School Code of Illinois, the board may not extend the school term beyond such closing date unless that extension of term is necessary to provide the minimum number of computable days. In case of such necessary extension, school employees shall be paid for such additional time on the basis of their regular contracts. A school board may specify a closing date earlier than that set on the annual calendar when the schools of the district have provided the minimum number of computable days under this section.

Nothing in this section prevents the board from employing superintendents of schools, principals, and other non-teaching personnel for a period of 12 months, or in the case of superintendents for a period in accordance with Section 10-23.8 of The School Code of Illinois, or prevents the board from employing other personnel before or after the regular school term with payment of salary proportionate to that received for comparable work during the school term (Section 10-19 of The School Code of Illinois).

4-2.9 Every school district should adopt a process of evaluation which will measure progress toward accomplishing its instructional goals.

4-2.10 Every school should make provisions for continuity and articulation of its programs from level to level and course to course. The central goal of such articulation should be the provision of programs adapted to the individual student's needs and abilities.

Table 1. Selected States for Comparison Purposes

State	School Year	Length of High School Day	Total Clock Hours
Illinois	176	5	880
Indiana	175	6	1050
Iowa	180	a.	
Michigan	180	b.	900
Missouri	174	6	1044
New York	190	a.	
Ohio	182	5	910
Pennsylvania	180	5 1/2	990
*Texas	165	7	1155

a. Minimum time per day not specified.

b. Michigan - 900 hours per year at the high school level.

* Lunch is included in the seven hours.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education	Twentieth Century Fund Task Force	ECS* Task Force on Education for Economic Growth	The College Board
Time			
Significantly more time should be devoted to learning the "new basics." School districts and state legislatures should strongly consider 7-hour school days, as well as a 200- to 220-day school year. Time available for learning should be expanded through better classroom management and organization of the school day. Additional instructional time should be found to meet the needs of slow learners, the gifted, and others who need more instructional diversity than can be provided in the conventional school day and year.	—No comparable provision—	Every state should increase the duration and intensity of academic learning time. Students should be introduced earlier to such critical subjects as science. Schools should examine each school year, especially the twelfth grade, to ensure that time is not wasted. Both states and localities should consider lengthening the school year and the school day by extending teachers' contracts. Learning time should be increased by establishing a wider range of learning opportunities beyond the normal school day and year.	—No comparable provision—
Textbooks and Instructional Materials			
Textbooks and tools of learning and teaching should be upgraded and updated to assure more rigorous content and to reflect current applications of technology, the best scholarship, and research findings. Funds should be made available to develop texts for the disadvantaged, learning disabled, and gifted and talented.	—No comparable provision—	—No comparable provision—	—No comparable provision—
Textbook Adoption			
In adopting textbooks, states and localities should evaluate texts on the basis of their capacity to present rigorous and challenging material clearly and should require publishers to furnish evaluative data on effectiveness.	—No comparable provision—	—No comparable provision—	—No comparable provision—
Homework			
Students in high school should be assigned homework.	—No comparable provision—	States and local school districts should establish firm, explicit, and demanding requirements concerning homework.	—No comparable provision—
Effective Study and Work Skills			
Effective study and work skills should be introduced in the early grades and continued throughout the student's schooling.	—No comparable provision—	—No comparable provision—	One of the Basic Academic Competencies which students should acquire.

Table 5

Total Instructional Time/Day in Minutes for Illinois High Schools, 1976-77 and 1981-82, and Illinois Junior High Schools, 1981-82

Range of Instructional Time A Day In Minutes		Number Reporting		%	
High Schools	Jr. High Schools	H.S.	Jr. High	H.S.	Jr. High
270-275	270-296	2	15	0	3
300-330	300-330	111	204	17	37
331-345	331-345	78	116	11	22
347-360	347-360	273	120	40	23
361-375	361-375	135	55	20	11
376-400	377-400	74	21	10	4
405-415	404-410	10	2	2	0
440		1	--	0	--

The mean for the high school group was 354 minutes while the mode was 360 minutes. No variation whatsoever was reported between the 76-77 and 81-82 academic years. The mean for the junior high school group was 338 minutes while the mode was 320 minutes.

Taken from Thurston, Paul W., Op. cit.

(Data taken from the Illinois State Board of Education "Census of Secondary School Course Offerings")

Table 6

Henry-Stark County School Day Length Survey
May 3, 1983

School Dist. #		K-8 School Day Length		9-12 School Day Length		Lunch Period Length
190		8:20-3:00		None		30 min.
223	(K-5) (6-8)	8:30-3:00 8:15-3:06		8:25-3:18		30
224		8:30-3:40		8:30-3:40		30
225		8:30-3:00		8:30-3:00		28
226		8:20-3:15		8:20-3:17	(K-1) (2) (3-12)	40 35 30
227	(1-6) (1-6) (7-8)	8:35-3:15 8:35-3:20 8:35-3:25	Town Country	8:35-3:30		30 to 80
228	(Millikin) (N. Side) (S. Side) (7-8)	8:30-3:07 8:30-3:12 8:00-2:20 8:25-3:15		8:25-3:25		30 to 40
229	(1) (2) (3-8)	8:30-3:00 8:30-3:20 8:30-3:25		8:30-3:15		30 to 75
230		8:30-3:14		8:25-3:17		37 to 40
233		8:25-3:24		8:25-3:24		30 to 70
1		8:15-3:15		8:20-3:20	(K-8) (9-12)	45 30
2	(K-6) (7-8)	8:25-3:20 8:30-3:12		8:20-3:30	(K-6) (7-8) (9-12)	40 30 33
27	(K-4) (5-8)	8:30-3:15 8:30-3:20		None		40
45		8:18-3:24		None		30
71		None		8:20-3:27		33

Taken from Thurston, Paul W., Op. cit.

Table 4*

Percent of City-School Systems Using Specified Hours for Opening and Closing Their Schools, 1947-48

Time Interval	Percent of city systems following schedule in		
	Elementary schools	Junior high schools	Senior high schools
1	2	3	4
for OPENING schools:			
By 8:15 am	3%	11%	17%
8:16 to 8:30 am	19	38	40
8:31 to 8:45 am	21	24	21
8:46 to 9:00 am	57	26	22
After 9:00 am	+	1	+
for CLOSING schools:			
By 2:15 pm	3%	3%	5%
2:16 to 2:30 pm	1	2	3
2:31 to 2:45 pm	3	2	3
2:46 to 3:00 pm	13	9	11
3:01 to 3:15 pm	12	14	12
3:16 to 3:30 pm	37	27	24
3:31 to 3:45 pm	14	16	16
3:46 to 4:00 pm	17	26	24
After 4:00 pm	+	1	2

+less than one-half of 1 percent.

*"Trends In City-School Organization 1938-1948," National Education Association Research Bulletin, vol. xxvii, No. 1, Feb. 1949, Table 26 at p. 33, reproduced.

Taken from Thurston, Paul W., Op. cit.

Table 2 - Average Length of School Term*

States	Average number of days schools were in session						Index of average length of school term			
	1880	1890	1900	1910	1920	1924	1880	1900	1920	1924
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
United States	130	135	144	158	162	168	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00
Alabama	81	74	78	117	123	133	.62	.54	.76	.79
Arizona	109	126	125	136	163	166	.84	.87	1.01	.99
Arkansas	....	75	78	107	126	135	....	.54	.78	.80
California	147	158	166	175	174	181	1.13	1.15	1.07	1.08
Colorado	132	144	150	156	168	174	1.02	1.04	1.04	1.04
Connecticut	179	183	189	185	184	183	1.38	1.31	1.14	1.09
Delaware	158	166	170	173	182	177	1.22	1.18	1.12	1.05
District of Columbia	193	178	179	181	178	180	1.48	1.24	1.10	1.07
Florida	....	120	93	106	133	143	....	.65	.82	.85
Georgia	65	83	112	144	145	140	.50	.68	.90	.83
Idaho	94	70	106	137	173	161	.72	.74	1.07	.96
Illinois	150	155	152	171	171	183	1.15	1.06	1.06	1.09
Indiana	136	130	156	147	156	172	1.05	1.08	.96	1.02
Iowa	148	156	160	172	174	176	1.14	1.11	1.07	1.05
Kansas	120	135	126	164	164	175	.92	.88	1.01	1.04
Kentucky	102	94	118	125	123	164	.78	.82	.76	.98
Louisiana	79	101	120	136	149	152	.61	.83	.92	.90
Maine	109	112	141	159	169	176	.84	.98	1.04	1.05
Maryland	187	184	183	185	180	185	1.44	1.27	1.11	1.10
Massachusetts	177	177	189	186	179	182	1.36	1.31	1.10	1.08
Michigan	150	156	164	171	172	178	1.15	1.14	1.06	1.06
Minnesota	94	128	169	149	160	179	.72	1.17	.99	1.07
Mississippi	75	86	101	123	122	137	.58	.70	.75	.82
Missouri	104	129	144	155	163	168	.80	1.00	1.01	1.01
Montana	96	143	107	185	166	171	.74	.74	1.02	1.02
Nebraska	82	140	135	174	164	173	.63	.94	1.01	1.03
Nevada	143	140	154	145	167	179	1.10	1.07	1.03	1.07
New Hampshire	105	118	148	164	174	172	.81	1.03	1.07	1.02
New Jersey	192	192	186	184	189	188	1.48	1.29	1.17	1.12
New Mexico	111	67	97	100	165	172	.85	.67	1.02	1.02
New York	179	187	175	188	188	193	1.38	1.22	1.16	1.12
North Carolina	50	59	71	102	134	143	.38	.49	.83	.85
North Dakota	96	113	156	147	167	165	.74	1.08	1.03	.98

Taken from Thurston, Paul W., Op. cit.

Table 2 (continued)

States	Average number of days schools were in session						Index of average length of school term			
	1880	1890	1900	1910	1920	1924	1880	1900	1920	1924
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
United States	130	135	144	158	162	168	1 00	1 00	1 00	1 00
Ohio	152	162	165	170	165	177	1.17	1.15	1.02	1.05
Oklahoma	....	....	95	140	166	164	....	.66	1.02	.98
Oregon	90	118	117	138	152	174	.69	.81	.94	1.04
Pennsylvania	133	148	167	170	177	181	1.02	1.16	1.09	1.08
Rhode Island	184	188	191	193	182	195	1.42	1.33	1.12	1.16
South Carolina	70	70	88	103	110	119	.54	.61	.68	.71
South Dakota	....	145	129	166	167	172	....	.90	1.03	1.02
Tennessee	68	86	96	130	134	148	.52	.67	.83	.88
Texas	72	100	108	131	156	136	.55	.75	.96	.81
Utah	128	133	151	165	166	169	.98	1.05	1.02	1.01
Vermont	126	136	156	160	162	162	.97	1.08	1.00	.96
Virginia	113	118	120	140	147	160	.87	.83	.91	.95
Washington	91	97	128	172	176	177	.70	.89	1.09	1.05
West Virginia	90	97	106	134	139	165	.69	.74	.86	.98
Wisconsin	165	159	160	180	175	177	1.27	1.11	1.08	1.05
Wyoming	119	120	110	141	152	175	.92	.76	.94	1.04

Figures in columns 2 to 8 from Statistics of State School Systems, 1923-24, U.S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1925, No. 42, p. 12.

The figure after each state in Column 8 is obtained by dividing each figure in Column 2 by 130. This gives the average school term, 130 days the value of 1; Alabama with an average term of 81 days in 1880, had an index rating of .62, see Column 8. This means that in 1880 the school term of Alabama was 62 percent as long as that maintained by the country as a whole. In 1924, the school term of Alabama was 79 percent (see Column 11) of that maintained by the country as a whole. Similarly interpret data in Columns 8-11 for other states.

*Reported as Table 8 in Research Bulletin of the National Education Association, Vol. IV, No. 4 (Sept. '26), at p. 207.

Taken from Thurston, Paul W., Op. cit.

Table 3

Summary of Time-on-Task Effects on Achievement

Study	Post Test	Pre Test	Measure of Time on task	Sample	Correlations: Achievement With Time	Correlations: Achievement with Time, Controlling for ability	Percentage of change in achievement attributable to time on task	
Edminston and Rhoades	CAT general achievement	--	attention	n = 94 high school seniors in one school system	.58	.43	.01	3%
Lahaderne	Scott Foresman Reading	Kuhlman Anderson IQ	attention	n = 65 boys in 4 sixth grade classes	.51	.31	.03	7%
	Stanford Arithmetic	IQ	attention	"	.53	.26	.04	8%
	Scott Foresman Reading	IQ	attention	n = 62 girls in 4 sixth grade classes	.49	.26	.03	7%
Cobb	Stanford Reading	--	attention	n = 103 fourth grade students in 5 classes in 2 schools	.49	.43	.02	7%
	Stanford Arithmetic				.25	.16	.00	0%
Smith	STEP Social Studies	CAT Nonverbal battery	allocated time	n = 68 fifth grade classes	.23	.17	.01	3%

Table 3 (cont'd)

Study	Post Test	Pre Test	Measure of Time on task	Sample	Correlations: Achievement With Time	Correlations: Achievement with Time, Controlling for ability	Percentage of change in achievement attributable to time on task
Bell and Davidson	Teacher made Ach Test	IQ	attention	n=23 classrooms of 4, 5, 6 grade students	.25	.27	.00 0%
Evertson, Emmer and Clements	English Content Specific	CAT	attention	n = 50 class-rooms, junior high	.29	.20	.00 0%
	Math Content Specific	CAT	attention	n = 50 class-rooms, junior high	.39	.34	.00 0%
Karweit and Slavin	CTBS	CTBS	engaged minutes	n = 33 students in 6 classes, grade 2/3	.42	.38	.03 - 18%
	CTBS	CTBS		n = 62 students in 12 classes, grade 4/5	.42	.09	.01 3%

Source: Karweit, N. Time on task. A research review. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Educational Excellence, 1983.

Taken from Phillips, Deborah, Op. cit.

Table 1

Average Allocated Time per Day in Different Activities

Activity	Grade 2		Grade 5	
	Minutes per day	Percentage of day	Minutes per day	Percentage of day
Academic activities	2'12"	57%	2'51"	60%
Reading and language arts	1'28"	(38%)	1'50"	(39%)
Mathematics	36"	(16%)	44"	(16%)
Other adacemic	8"	(3%)	17"	(6%)
Nonacademic activities	55"	24%	1'05"	23%
Noninstructional activities	44"	19%	47"	17%
Lunch, recess, breaks	1'15"		1'17"	
Length of school day	5'06"		6'00"	

Source: Rosenshine, B. How time is spent in elementary classrooms. In C. Dehhan and A. Lieberman (Eds.). Time to learn. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1980, p. 125.

Taken from Phillips, Deborah, Op. cit.

THE CLASSIFICATION OF MATHEMATICS. 1868 AND 1979 COMPARED

Subdivisions of the *Jahrbuch über die Fortschritte der Mathematik*, 1868.

History and Philosophy
Algebra
Number Theory
Probability
Series
Differential and Integral Calculus
Theory of Functions
Analytic Geometry
Synthetic Geometry
Mechanics
Mathematical Physics
Geodesy and Astronomy

THIRTY-EIGHT SUBCATEGORIES

The Classification of Mathematics, 1979
(From the *Mathematical Reviews*)

General
History and biography

Logic and foundations
Set theory
Combinatorics, graph theory
Order, lattices, ordered algebraic structures
General mathematical systems

Number theory
Algebraic number theory, field theory and polynomials
Commutative rings and algebras
Algebraic geometry
Linear and multilinear algebra; matrix theory
Associative rings and algebras

Taken from Davis, Philip J./ Hersh, Reuben, Op. cit.

Nonassociative rings and algebras
Category theory, homological algebra

Group theory and generalizations
Topological groups, Lie groups

Functions of real variables
Measure and integration
Functions of a complex variable
Potential theory
Several complex variables and analytic spaces
Special functions
Ordinary differential equations
Partial differential equations
Finite differences and functional equations

Sequences, series, summability
Approximations and expansions
Fourier analysis
Abstract harmonic analysis
Integral transforms, operational calculus
Integral equations
Functional analysis
Operator theory
Calculus of variations and optimal control

Geometry
Convex sets and geometric inequalities
Differential geometry
General topology
Algebraic topology
Manifolds and cell complexes
Global analysis, analysis on manifolds

Probability theory and stochastic processes
Statistics
Numerical analysis
Computer science
General applied mathematics

Mechanics of particles and systems
Mechanics of solids
Fluid mechanics, acoustics
Optics, electromagnetic theory

Classical thermodynamics, heat transfer
Quantum mechanics
Statistical physics, structure of matter
Relativity
Astronomy and astrophysics
Geophysics

Economics, operations research, programming, games
Biology and behavioral sciences
Systems, control
Information and communication, circuits, automata

APPROXIMATELY 3400 SUBCATEGORIES

Taken from Davis, Philip J./ Hersh, Reuben, Op. cit.

Illinois
State Board of
Education

100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

Walter W. Naumer, Jr., Chairman
Illinois State Board of Education

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

EDUCATION IS EVERYONE'S FUTURE

Bulk Rate
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 805
Springfield, IL

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
Printed by the Authority of the State of Illinois
October 1983 5M 4-340B1-67 No. 303